

22 July 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, Psychological Services Staff  
FROM : Support Services Historical Officer (SSHO)  
ATTENTION :  PSS/OMS 25X1  
SUBJECT : History of High Risk of Capture Program  
(Draft) and Outline of Overseas Test  
Battery Program (Draft)

1. I have just completed a hasty review of the subject history and the outline -- both in draft form -- and I am not clear whether these are intended to be submitted as separate histories or are to be portions of an overall history of the Psychological Services Staff (PSS) and its predecessor, the Assessment and Evaluation Staff (AES). I suggest therefore, that after reviewing this memorandum Chief, PSS and his representatives and I meet to discuss the total historical effort of PSS.

2. With reference to the brief (6 pages) piece on the overseas test battery, I have few comments:

a. This is basically a current status report and not a history. It is presented in generalities and can be summed up that the Agency developed tests that were useful in selecting trainees (regardless of national origin) for unconventional warfare who were most amenable to such training.

b. If this is to be a history, it will have to go into detail on the tests, modification of tests, and PSS evaluation of both the tests and the testing program.

c. Moreover, for historical purposes, haven't similar programs been developed for foreign nationals in many areas of the world besides SEA -- Cubans, Soviets, et al.? Also, what use is made of such tests for both agent and source selection?

~~SECRET~~

000237

3. Aside from the fact that it is overstuffed with platitudes regarding PSS, there are a number of other flaws in the report on the Risk of Capture (ROC) program:

a. The paper needs to be restructured so that it will be both more readable and meaningful. I have ventured a new outline which is attached. It also needs to be written from the impersonal rather than personal point of view.

b. There is an obvious attempt to duck the early history of the program, but it will be necessary to go back to [ ] and see what records are available -- whether or not "easily available" is not necessarily the basis for the historical effort.

c. Some better introduction to Downey, Fecteau, [ ] must be given.

d. Discussion of the early Agency Regulations on conduct and risk of capture must be introduced and copies of the early regulations should be attached as part of the history.

e. What was the nature of the training that was to be "improved" (p. 1) following Powers capture? You'll also have to respond to Powers' contention (Overflight) that he had no indoctrination. Also was PSS involved with Col. Abel?

f. At all points in <sup>the</sup> paper complete names and identities are required at first reference, and abbreviations follow only after complete identification -- DPD, OSA, [ ] (p. 1, par. 2). Also there must be no question regarding a given date -- were "June meetings" (p. 2) held in June 1961? Were DPD meetings from "22 May to 2 June" held in 1961?

g. There is a reference (p. 2) to ROC training [ ] put on by "Drs. [ ] from BAB/TSD," but the reader learns nothing about the nature of the training, the number of students, or the evaluation of the course. This lack of information is characteristic of other segments of the report -- an event is mentioned and then dropped. Also why is it necessary to say that "OTR was obviously working closely with DPD . . ." It is made to sound as if this fact was difficult to establish or continues (in 1971) to be extremely sensitive -- neither of which is true.

h. If there was a PSS role in the Powers episode or in the [redacted] it needs to be spelled out in detail. If the role was simply that of observer, then this needs to be stated. The statement making reference (p. 2) to CI's assistance in breaking through "security barriers" is very misleading, suggesting penetration of Lubyanka prison by the Agency.

25X1

i. The introduction of the name of Dr. [redacted] (p. 2) is another sample of the failure of the report to follow the story through -- what did [redacted] contribute and was he a continuing participant in the ROC program?

25X1

25X1

j. Reference is made (p. 3) to the fact that PSS submitted to DPD "a full outline for a complete Risk of Capture Program." Exactly what was the program? There should be textual discussion and probably a copy of the outline should appear as an attachment to the report. How did PSS come up with this particular outline at this particular time? What was the DPD reaction to the outline?

k. The last par. on p. 3 refers to the paucity of records for 1963 -- how thorough was your search? In the same par. the reference to "earlier correspondence" is meaningless -- use the specific date. On p. 4, the year of 1964 is also written off because of lack of records "in the Psychological Services Staff." Again, how far did you pursue the subject? DPD files? OSA files? OTR files?

l. [redacted] turns up on p. 4. Who was he?

25X1

m. If the research effort on communist prisons, guards, and techniques of interrogation (p. 4) was so significant, then the nature of the research effort needs to be spelled out. Was the study limited to the problem of oriental communism or did it include European communist tactics and facilities? Again, however, you beg the question of adequacy of research by suggesting that files in other components may have useful information -- the job of research is for the PSS historian(s).

n. There are two incomplete references on p. 5 -- one to a [redacted] (sp?) and another to an "Attached Schedule."

25X1

SECRET

o. The second par. on p. 6 begins with the following sentence: "The desire to maintain liaison contacts in order to check out all hypotheses and to remain as valid as possible persisted in PSS." The meaning of such a sentence poses a few questions:

- 1) With whom were liaison contacts being maintained?
- 2) About what were hypotheses being posed?
- 3) What's to "remain valid" -- sounds like a license or certificate.

p. Reference is made (p. 6) to a meeting on 13 July 1966, but the subject is not specified, the significance not spelled out, the various positions or suggestions discussed -- that PSS was "delighted to share our experiences and learn from them insofar as security permitted" leaves a great deal to the imagination. Also with reference to this same meeting, is the spelling correct as given for [REDACTED]

25X1

25X1

q. There seems to be some confusion (pp. 7-8) with reference to which Navy captain was in charge of the East Coast ROC program. Give the complete name of [REDACTED]

25X1

r. Page 8 refers to DDS support for "such a committee." Is this a reference to the ad hoc Prisoner Exploitation Committee: This committee had a meeting on 15 April of what year (p. 9)?

s. There is considerable importance attached (pp. 10-11) to the ROC program of 4-5 November 1968 for Phase II of the Operations course, but no specifics of the session are given. What was new? Benedetto (Ben) De Felice is introduced as a leading authority on ROC at this meeting. Heretofore, the impression has been given that the expertise on the subject was being developed within PSS. Did Ben work with PSS? If not, where did he acquire the knowledge to tell the students in the Ops course "of the steps which they could take which would make incarceration easier" (p. 10)?

SECRET

t. The Prisoner Exploitation Committee prepared a memo in December 1968, but the reader is not told to whom the memo was addressed. This might also be a document worth using as an attachment to the report.

u. Reference is made (pp. 10-11) to some discussions between Mr. William Abbott of the Navy and [ ] of PSS regarding development of the Navy's program for "processing and rehabilitation [sic] of returnees from imprisonment," but it is noted that no "written correspondence" regarding the discussions is available to the PSS representative. As a participant in the discussions, there should be something that can be said about the meeting, particularly since it is assumed (p. 11) that the meetings had direct bearing on the request for [ ] participation in the debriefing of the Pueblo crew.

25X1

25X1

v. It is good to tell the reader that as a result of the Agency representative's participation in the Pueblo debriefing that PSS's credibility held up -- it would be even more to the point of the history to tell in some detail what PSS gained by having a participant in on the debriefing and how such learning was then applied to Agency ROC programs.

w. Referring to the DDS response to recommendations from PEC, it is noted (p. 11) that the DDS requested "more specific recommendations on all counts." What does that mean? What did PEC recommend in November 1969? What was the response of the Executive Director-Comptroller to the recommendations of PEC?

x. Discuss (p. 12) prison, prison mentality, actions, answers, etc., and then discuss Agency efforts toward both POW's and their families.

y. Even if used correctly, the report will be improved by deleting the word "practicum" each time it appears.

z. Some confusion results (p. 13) regarding the DDS recommendation for a one day program on ROC. Was the program to be:

- 1) for "all Agency personnel (line 1)"?
- 2) for "all TDY and PCS agency personnel (line 4)"?
- 3) only for TDY and PCS personnel in areas where there was high risk of capture?

4. In addition to the foregoing criticisms, suggestions, and questions, I would also emphasize that the so-called list of "Source Material" for the report is useless in its present form. The procedures for documenting historical reports is spelled out in detail in the Historical Staff, Style Manual. If you do not have copies, I can provide some.

5. A further question regarding the ROC program which should be discussed (or written off) is whether or not there have been any practical tests of the teaching? Have any Agency personnel who have had the program been captured and released? Or are there any who are now POW's who have been through the program?

6. As I have already noted, I'll be available for discussion of the PSS program at your convenience.

25X1

Attachment

Distribution:

Orig. and 1-Addressee

1-Ch/HS

1-DCh/HS

1-☐

✓1-Chrono

STAT

SECRET

Draft Outline

Risk of Capture Program

Foreword

I. Background

- A. WWII
- B. Korea (very briefly, what was the record re US POW's and what did the most significant studies reveal?)

II. Early Agency Involvement

- A. Korea
- B. Fecteau-Downey-
- C. Code of Conduct, 1952

25X1

III. The U-2 Episode: A Learning Experience

- A. Program planning pre-Powers release
- B. Program planning after Powers release
- C. Powers as an adviser

IV. Growth and Development of the ROC Program

- A.  Programs (academic and practical)
- B. Interagency support (USIB)
- C. Prisoner Exploitation Committee
- D. The Pueblo experience
- E. Programs and program revisions
  - 1. Academic
  - 2. Practical

25X1

V. Prospects

SECRET